

## **REMARKS**

Claims pending in the application are 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 23-27, 29, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88, 89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102, 103, 105, 109, 110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147 and 149-155. Of the above claims, 3,5,6,12, 14-16, 19, 21, 22, 28, 30-32, 36, 38-40, 42-44, 48, 50-52, 54-80, 84, 86, 87, 90, 92-94, 98, 100, 101, 104, 106-108, 111, 119, 129, 136, 142 and 148 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 13, 17, 18, 20, 23-27, 29, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88, 89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102, 103, 105, 109, 110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147 and 149-155 stand rejected.

Applicants herein amend claims 1, 9, 10, 17, 25, 26, 33, 45, 81, 95, 109, 117, 121, 122, 123, 125, 132, 139, 145, 151, 152, 154, and 155 and cancel claims 13, and 29. No new matter has been added. As a result claims 1, 2, 4, 7-11, 17, 18, 20, 23-27, 33-35, 37, 41, 45-47, 49, 53, 81-83, 85, 88, 89, 91, 95-97, 99, 102, 103, 105, 109, 110, 112-118, 120-128, 130-135, 137-141, 143-147 and 149-155. are pending. Applicant requests examination in view of the amendments and remarks below.

### ***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent Number 6,579, 184 (“Tanskanen”) in view of online Monopoly®. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant submits that claim 1 as amended overcomes the combination of Tanskanen and online Monopoly®. For example, the combination of Tanskanen in view of online Monopoly fails to teach or suggest at least “identifying one or more remote terminals for a game by utilizing one or more stored numbers associated with said one or more remote terminals.” For example, in one implementation, upon activation “the identities of the terminals communicating over the communications link are determined (such as *retrieving them from memory*).”(Application at p. 3 paragraph [0031])(emphasis added). More specifically, in this implementation the terminal can be configured to retrieve, for example, the cellular phone number of the person they are chatting with from memory and use this

number to identity the other terminals for a game. (See, e.g., Application at p. 4, paragraph [0040]). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Insomuch as claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 they too patentably define over the art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Independent claims 17, 151, and 152 recite similar elements to that of claim 1 and they too patentably define over the art for at least similar reasons with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, and 27 depend directly or indirectly from claim 17 they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claim 33 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanskanen in view of online Monopoly®. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant submits that claim 33 as amended overcomes the combination of Tanskanen and online Monopoly®. For example, the combination of Tanskanen in view of online Monopoly® fails to teach or suggest at least “transmitting a signal representing said outcome to send to each of said terminals for display, the signal being configured to be received and decoded by said remote terminals.” The Examiner stated that Tanskanen teaches that “[t]he DTMF player input signals [are] transmitted and *received by said player and other player’s game devises.*” (Office Action dated October 31, 2006 at p. 3.) Applicant respectfully disagrees. Tanskanen teaches using a cellular phone as a controller to send commands as DTMF signals to a server, the server then transforms the signals into commands the video game system can utilize and modifies the game based on the commands. Then, the server transmits a TV signal to a user’s TV. The signal transmitted to the TV is a different signal type than the signal initially transmitted by controller, i.e., “the player input data may be ... (DTMF) data that is input by the players using telephone keypads” (Tanskanen, col. 2, lines 1 – 4) and “the video may [be] received *over a broadcast video network.*” (Tanskanen, col. 2, lines 20 – 25)(emphasis added). Tanskanen fails to teach transmitting *a* signal from one device and another device receiving *the* signal, and decoding *the* signal into commands that the device can process. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Insomuch as claims 34, 35, 37, and 41 depend directly or indirectly from claim 33 they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Independent claims 45, 125, 132, 139, 145, 153, and 155 recite similar elements to that of claim 33 and patentably define over the art for at least similar reasons with respect to claim 33. Insomuch as claims 46, 47, 49, 53, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 147, 149, 150, and 154 depend directly or indirectly from claims 45, 125, 132, 139, 145, 153 they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

Claim 81 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Tanskanen in view of online Monopoly®. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 81 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and claim 33 therefore claim 81 patentably defines over the cited art for at least the reasons stated with respect to claims 1 and 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Insomuch as claims 82, 83, 85, 88, 89, and 91 depend directly or indirectly from claim 81 they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Independent claims 91, 109, 117 recite similar elements to that of claim 81 and patentably define over the art for at least similar reasons with respect to claim 81. Insomuch as claims 96, 97, 99, 102, 103, 105, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125 depend directly or indirectly from claims 91, 109, 117 they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

**DOCKET NO.:** IVNI-0006  
**Application No.:** 09/870,210  
**Office Action Dated:** October 31, 2006

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and a prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance of all claims.

Date: April 2, 2007

/David M. Platz/  
David M. Platz  
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439